

REMARKS

Claims 2-7, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19 are pending in the present application, claims 1, 8-10, 12, 14, and 16 having been canceled and claims 18-19 having been added herein. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's supervisor is thanked for the courtesies extended during the interview on January 10, 2006. The amendments and remarks submitted in this response are substantially in accordance with the discussions during that interview. However, Applicant has also added claim 19, which corresponds to the alternative deleted from claim 7. Claim 18 has been rewritten to respond to the concern raised during the interview regarding whether the claim correctly reflected the embodiments shown in the figures. Claims 7 and 18 correspond to the embodiments shown in Figs. 8-12 and claim 19 corresponds to the embodiments shown in Figs. 6 and 7.

During the interview, the Examiner's supervisor asked for an English language translation of the Taiwanese office action submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 10, 2005, so that the references cited therein could be considered. Applicant notes, however, the IDS cited two documents, JP 2002-076443 and TW 499745. English language abstracts for both of these documents were submitted with the IDS. Additionally, a machine English

translation of the Japanese document was also submitted. Applicant respectfully submits that these submissions satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.97 and 1.98, and request consideration of these documents. If this objection to the IDS is maintained, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to resolve the issue.

Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sugimoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0190304). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sugimoto in view of Huang (U.S. Patent No. 5,947,588). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sugimoto in view of Yamaguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,564,819). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the interview, claim 5 now recites an LED lamp including a circuit substrate provided with an electrode pattern, a light emitting unit mounted on the circuit substrate, and a reflecting frame mounted on the circuit substrate. The reflecting frame includes a concave portion disposed to surround the light emitting unit. A lens body is disposed above the light emitting unit and attached to the reflecting frame to seal the concave portion of the reflecting frame. One air hole provided in at least one of the circuit substrate, the reflecting frame and the lens body for communication between the sealed concave portion of the reflecting frame and an outside of the lamp. A reflecting

surface is formed on an inner peripheral surface of the concave portion of the reflecting frame. The reflecting surface includes a taper shape configured to broaden toward an upper end of the reflecting frame. This is not taught or disclosed by the prior art of record.

Sugimoto discloses an LED lamp that includes a substrate 1, and LED unit 2, and an optical unit 4. The optical unit 4, as shown in Fig. 30, sits in the frame at a space above the substrate, and is supported there by a supporting member not shown in the drawings. See paragraph [0062]. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the optical unit does not seal the concave portion provided in the substrate that houses the LED unit. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the Sugimoto disclosure does not anticipate claim 5.

Applicant respectfully submits that Huang and Yamaguchi do not remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to Sugimoto. Thus, Claims 2-4, 6-7, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19 are believed to patentable in and of themselves and for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5, from which they depend.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

Appln. No. 10/820,109  
Amd. dated January 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 14, 2005

If the Examiner has any questions he is invited to  
contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By: Ronni S. Jillions  
Ronni S. Jillions  
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:tbs:srd  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\A\Asak\Omata2\pto\06-01-17 amendment.doc

*by Anne M. Farber*  
Reg. No. 25,884